

Red  
12/22/97

ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION**

---

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

In re the Matter of:	)	
	)	
GERARD A. TURRO	)	MM Docket No. 97-122
	)	
For Renewal of License	)	
For FM Translator Stations	)	File No.: BRFT-970129YC
W276AQ(FM), Fort Lee, NJ,	)	
and W232AL (FM), Pomona, NY,	)	File No.: BRFT-970129YD
	)	
MONTICELLO MOUNTAINTOP	)	
BROADCASTING, INC.	)	
	)	
Order to Show Cause Why the	)	
Construction Permit for FM Radio	)	
Station WJUX (FM), Monticello,	)	
NY, Should Not Be Revoked	)	

Volume VI

Pages: 584 through 810

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: December 3, 1997

---

**HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION**

*Official Reporters*  
1220 L Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, D.C.  
(202) 628-4888

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In re Applications of:	)	
	)	
GERARD A. TURRO	)	MM Docket No. 97-122
For Renewal of License	)	
For FM Translator Stations	)	File No.: BRFT-970129YC
W276AQ(FM), Fort Lee, NJ,	)	
and W232AL (FM), Pomona, NY,	)	File No.: BRFT-970129YD
	)	
MONTICELLO MOUNTAINTOP	)	
BROADCASTING, INC.	)	
	)	
Order to Show Cause Why the	)	
Construction Permit for FM Radio	)	
Station WJUX (FM), Monticello,	)	
NY, Should Not Be Revoked	)	

Second Floor  
Federal Communications  
Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C.

Wednesday,  
December 3, 1997

The parties met, pursuant to the notice of the  
Judge, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE: HON. ARTHUR I. STEINBERG  
Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

For Gerard A. Turro:

ALAN Y. NAFTALIN, ESQ.  
CHARLES R. NAFTALIN, ESQ.  
Koteen and Naftalin, L.L.P.  
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 467-5700

Heritage Reporting Corporation  
(202) 628-4888

## APPEARANCES (cont'd)

For Monticello Mountaintop Broadcasting, Inc.:

JAMES P. RILEY, ESQ.  
Fletcher, Heald and Hildreth, P.L.C.  
1300 North 17th Street, 11th Floor  
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209  
(703) 812-0450

On behalf of Federal Communications Commission:

ALAN E. ARONOWITZ, ESQ.  
SUZAN B. FRIEDMAN, ESQ.  
JAMES BRADSHAW, ENGINEER  
Federal Communications Commission  
Mass Media Bureau  
Enforcement Division  
2025 M Street, N.W., Room 8210  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(202) 418-1430

On behalf of Universal Broadcasting of New York, Inc.:

RICHARD A. HELMICK, ESQ.  
Cohn and Marks  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 452-4831

I N D E X

<u>WITNESSES:</u>	<u>DIRECT</u>	<u>CROSS</u>	<u>REDIRECT</u>	<u>RECROSS</u>	<u>VOIR DIRE</u>
Jules Cohen					
by Mr. Naftalin	--	590	--	629	--
by Mr. Aronowitz	--	--	614	--	--
by Mr. Helmick	--	--	619	--	--
Wilson LaFollette	--	--	--	--	--
by Mr. A. Naftalin	--	647	--	706	--
by Mr. Riley	--	677	--	--	--
by Judge Steinberg	696	--	--	--	--
by Mr. Helmick	--	--	701	--	--
Vincent Luna	--	--	--	--	--
by Mr. Naftalin	--	710	--	--	--
by Mr. Riley	--	793	--	801	--
by Judge Steinberg	782	--	--	--	--
by Mr. Helmick	--	--	794	--	--

E X H I B I T S

	<u>IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>RECEIVED</u>	<u>REJECTED</u>
<u>Turro:</u>			
31	609	--	--
<u>Mass Media:</u>			
37	644	646	--

Hearing Began:	9:30 a.m.	Hearing Ended:	4:55 p.m.
Recess Began:	1:20 p.m.	Recess Ended:	2:30 p.m.

1                   P R O C E E D I N G S

2                   JUDGE STEINBERG: Good morning. This is a  
3 continuation of the hearing.

4                   Who is the next witness, Mr. Aronowitz or Mr.  
5 Helmick?

6                   MR. ARONOWITZ: Jules Cohen.

7                   JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Is he being presented by  
8 Universal or both?

9                   MR. ARONOWITZ: Both.

10                  JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Mr. Cohen?

11                  MR. RILEY: Your Honor, I wonder if I might raise  
12 a preliminary matter with you?

13                  JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.

14                  MR. RILEY: There was examination yesterday of Mr.  
15 Loginow that dealt more extensively than I had anticipated  
16 with the 1988 policy statement. Last evening, without an  
17 exhaustive search, we were unable to locate either an  
18 unofficial citation or an official FCC record or FCC second  
19 cite to it. It may be that ultimately we will come up with  
20 one, but I would want to make certain that everybody has a  
21 copy of that document because it may end up being inserted  
22 in the findings.

23                  I wonder if it might be acceptable, Your Honor, to  
24 the parties to have it included in the record as Monticello  
25 Mountaintop Exhibit 8?

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.

2 MR. ARONOWITZ: Or I can give you the cite.

3 MR. RILEY: Do you have an official cite to it?

4 MR. ARONOWITZ: I had originally obtained it, and  
5 it was referenced in the translator report and order. I am  
6 informed that the cite is 3 FCC Record 5695, 53 Federal  
7 Register 37762, and the Federal Register date appears to be  
8 9-28-88.

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: I am probably the only one that  
10 would not have a copy of it, so --

11 MR. RILEY: Would you like a copy?

12 JUDGE STEINBERG: I would love a copy.

13 Thank you. Then I will get the cite later, if I  
14 did not write it down.

15 Anything more preliminary?

16 MR. RILEY: No, Your Honor.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

18 Mr. Cohen, would you raise your right hand,  
19 please?

20 Whereupon,

21 JULES COHEN

22 having been first duly sworn, was called as a witness  
23 herein, and was examined and testified as follows:

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: Could you please state your name  
25 and address for the record?

1 THE WITNESS: Jules Cohen. My office address is  
2 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 402, Washington, D.C.

3 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Who will be --

4 MR. HELMICK: It is for re-cross.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. So, we are ready for  
6 cross right now?

7 Okay. Mr. Naftalin?

8 Let's just make a distinction. Yesterday, the  
9 questioning was by Charles Naftalin and today it is by Alan  
10 Naftalin. Is that correct?

11 MR. A. NAFTALIN: That is correct.

12 JUDGE STEINBERG: Because we will have two Mr.  
13 Naftalins and I suppose Mr. Charles will not be questioning  
14 this witness.

15 MR. C. NAFTALIN: That is correct, Your Honor.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. So, all this questioning  
17 is by Alan.

18 MR. HELMICK: There is one other matter, Your  
19 Honor. The engineering personnel are both here.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Oh, right.

21 MR. HELMICK: Both people are in the room, and I  
22 think that we discussed informally before Your Honor came in  
23 that since all these hearing personnel have seen the  
24 testimony of each other then it would be appropriate for  
25 them to be in the room.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: Does anybody want that  
2 reconsidered? I just think it would be easier.

3 MR. C. NAFTALIN: Well, Your Honor, we agree to  
4 that. I would just like to recognize that Mr. Hidle is here  
5 today, but Mr. Hurst is not.

6 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. That was Charles talking.  
7 Okay, Mr. Alan.

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

10 Q Good morning, Mr. Cohen.

11 A Good morning, Mr. Naftalin.

12 Q When were you first retained by Universal in  
13 connection with this matter?

14 A I don't know the exact date, Mr. Naftalin, but it  
15 was sometime toward the middle of last year.

16 Q And what were you asked to do?

17 A I was asked to make a theoretical study of the  
18 signal strength at the Fort Lee translator from WJUX in  
19 Monticello, New York.

20 Q Who asked you to do that?

21 A I was asked by Mr. Helmick.

22 Q Did you ever have any conversations with Mr.  
23 Warshaw about the subject matter?

24 A Not about my analysis, no.

25 Q I did not hear the end of that.



1           A     I did not have any. I have not had any  
2     conversations with Mr. Warshaw about the testimony that I  
3     prepared.

4           Q     Did you have any conversations with him concerning  
5     this case?

6           A     I have to be careful about when you say this case.  
7     Mr. Warshaw has mentioned to me his conflict with Mr. Turro,  
8     but specifically about this case, no. I don't think we've  
9     discussed it.

10          Q     Between whenever you were retained and the date of  
11     July 9, 1997, which is the date of your statement, what  
12     information were you furnished by either Universal or the  
13     Bureau?

14          A     I was not provided any information by Universal.  
15     I was asked to make this study, and my sources were the  
16     Federal Communications database.

17          Q     Very good. And is the same true as between  
18     July 9, which is the date of your statement, and October 22,  
19     which is the time you affirmed it for the purposes of this  
20     hearing?

21          A     Yes. The same response would apply.

22          Q     Have you since then reviewed the engineering  
23     material that was furnished on behalf of Mr. Turro?

24          A     I reviewed the engineering that was provided by  
25     Mr. Hurst.

1 Q Specifically can we identify? Do you mean Turro  
2 Exhibit 2?

3 JUDGE STEINBERG: Why do you not show him?

4 MR. C. NAFTALIN: I have it right here.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: In other words, just for ease of  
6 the record you do not object if I refer to Mr. Alan and Mr.  
7 Charles?

8 MR. A. NAFTALIN: Not at all.

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Why does everyone not do that  
10 when the two Naftalins are in the hearing room? There is  
11 only one Mr. Aronowitz. We can stipulate to that.

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe this is the Hurst  
13 statement that I reviewed.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: And you are looking at Turro  
15 Exhibit 2?

16 THE WITNESS: Exhibit 2. Yes, sir.

17 BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

18 Q And you reviewed that after you prepared this  
19 statement and after October 22? After you prepared your  
20 statement, which is Mass Media Exhibit 5?

21 A It was after I prepared my exhibit, yes, but I  
22 can't tell you what date it was.

23 Q I understand. It was after October 22, which is  
24 when you affirmed it, the date of your affirmation? Is that  
25 right?

1           A     I'm not sure if it was before or after.

2           Q     Would you turn to the first page of your actual  
3 statement, which is Bates No. 89, Page 89? Do you have that  
4 in front of you?

5           JUDGE STEINBERG: Let me just see your copy. Mr.  
6 Cohen's copy does not have our Bates stamp page numbers on  
7 it.

8           MR. A. NAFTALIN: It is a very short statement.  
9 We will not have any problem.

10          JUDGE STEINBERG: He is looking at the same page  
11 that we have as Page 89?

12          MR. A. NAFTALIN: Correct.

13          BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

14          Q     You say there that the statement is directed in  
15 particular to the question of whether or not translator  
16 station W276AQ in Fort Lee, New Jersey, could receive the  
17 signal from WJUX Monticello, New York, of such reliability  
18 that it could be the basis of delivery of a high quality  
19 signal to Bergen County and adjacent areas.

20                That is the only subject of your statement? Is  
21 that correct?

22          A     Yes, sir, it is.

23          Q     Again?

24          A     Yes, sir.

25          Q     Is it your understanding that Mr. Turro is also

1 the licensee of a translator station in Pomona?

2 A That is my understanding.

3 Q And is it your understanding that that station  
4 rebroadcasts the signal of station WJUX?

5 A I understand that, yes.

6 Q And that the Fort Lee translator at least at some  
7 times rebroadcasts the signal of the Pomona translator?

8 A I think I have been so advised.

9 Q But you have not made a study of that path?

10 A No, sir.

11 Q Do you have any understanding at all as to the  
12 nature of the quality of the signal produced in that manner  
13 to Fort Lee?

14 A No, I don't.

15 Q What your statement does do is it makes a  
16 prediction of signal strength from WJUX off the air to Fort  
17 Lee, to the Fort Lee location. Is that correct?

18 A That is correct. That is correct, sir.

19 Q As you said, that is a theoretical study?

20 A Yes, sir.

21 Q You have not visited those locations?

22 A No, sir.

23 Q And you have not examined any of the equipment  
24 that was being used or being employed?

25 A No, sir, I have not.

1           Q     And the theoretical method of prediction, and see  
2     if I am correct about this, is first to establish the  
3     distance between JUX and Fort Lee and the elevations of the  
4     points of signal origination and reception and then the  
5     strength of the originating signal based upon the FCC's  
6     records, and by the use of a terrain profile and the  
7     Longley-Rice Version 1.22 methodology to predict the extent  
8     of signal attenuation due to distance and terrain factors  
9     and thereby predict the signal in Fort Lee? Is that a fair  
10    statement?

11           A     I believe it is.

12           Q     Now, you say in your statement on Page 2 of your  
13    statement --

14                   JUDGE STEINBERG: We are now on Page 90.

15                   MR. A. NAFTALIN: It is Page 90.

16                   BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

17           Q     -- that the signal strength predicted to exist at  
18    the Fort Lee translator from the JUX transmission is 5.5  
19    dBu?

20           A     That is correct, sir.

21           Q     Is that a prediction that that is actually the  
22    signal that you expect, or is that a prediction that the  
23    signal will be at least that amount?

24           A     That is a prediction that the signal will be at  
25    least that much for 90 percent of the time.

1 Q Will be that amount or more for 90 percent of the  
2 time?

3 A That amount or more for 90 percent of the time,  
4 yes.

5 Q With a high degree of confidence?

6 A With a confidence factor of about 90 percent.

7 Q But it is not actually your prediction that the  
8 signal will be 5.5 dBu, is it, at any given time?

9 A Yes, it would --

10 Q Or more?

11 A -- on the basis of at any given time.

12 Q It would be that amount or more, right?

13 A It could also be that amount or less.

14 Q What are the odds that it would be less?

15 A Ten percent of the time we would expect the signal  
16 strength to be less.

17 Q So 90 percent it would be more?

18 A That or more.

19 Q That or more. Okay. What is the predicted median  
20 field that you have?

21 A The predicted median field would be 10.4 dB  
22 greater than that. It would be 15.9 dBu.

23 Q Is that true, or did you put a confidence factor  
24 in there as well?

25 A Well, there is a confidence factor, yes. In this

1 instance, what I was directed to investigate was whether or  
2 not there was likely to be a signal at the Fort Lee  
3 translator which was suitable for rebroadcast.

4 Certainly for a signal to be rebroadcast, one has  
5 to have a high degree of reliability. Therefore, the ten dB  
6 factor that was incorporated in the Longley-Rice method in  
7 order to arrive at a 90 percent confidence factor was  
8 certainly appropriate for rebroadcast.

9 Q A confidence factor is based on statistical  
10 likelihood, is it not? That is what you mean?

11 A Yes, it is.

12 Q If you forgot about the statistical probability,  
13 the statistical confidence factor, and just made a  
14 prediction of the median field, what would you get? You  
15 would get ten dB more, would you not?

16 A For a confidence factor of no greater than 50  
17 percent. I am resisting putting that one in, Mr. Naftalin,  
18 because of the purpose of this signal, which is rebroadcast.

19 Q I understand, but if you were just making a  
20 prediction as to whether the median field, that is a field  
21 where the chances are there is going to be as many signals  
22 higher as lower, you would come up with another ten dB,  
23 would you not? Forget about the confidence level now.

24 A Forget about the confidence level and forget about  
25 the 90 percent of the time?

1 Q Yes.

2 A Yes. If it was 50 percent of the locations 50  
3 percent of the time and no more than a 50 percent confidence  
4 factor, it would be 20.4 plus 5.5.

5 Q It would be 25.9?

6 A That is correct, sir.

7 Q Are you aware that that is not very far from what  
8 your colleague, Mr. LaFollette, actually measured?

9 A I don't recall what Mr. LaFollette measured.

10 Q You have not looked at his material?

11 A I believe I have seen Mr. LaFollette's material,  
12 yes, but I don't have it committed to memory.

13 Q And you looked at Mr. Hurst's material?

14 A Yes, I did.

15 Q Do you have a recollection as to what measurements  
16 they came up with?

17 A I don't recall. They were fairly high, but I  
18 don't recall what they were.

19 Q It was something considerably over 5.5, was it  
20 not?

21 A Yes. I'm sure of that.

22 Q I would like to talk a little bit about the  
23 statement that you made. On Page 3 of your statement, which  
24 is Bates stamp Page 91, you say there that there is an  
25 undesired signal. There is a first adjacent channel signal,



1 WBAI in New York, right?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q And you calculated at the Fort Lee location that  
4 would have a signal strength of 91.8 dBu?

5 A Yes, sir.

6 Q Which is 86.3 dB greater than the calculation in  
7 this 5.5 microvolt calculation you made for WJUX?

8 A Yes, sir.

9 Q And you say that a combination of sophisticated  
10 filtering and antenna discrimination could not eliminate  
11 completely interference from this first adjacent channel  
12 station?

13 A That is correct, sir.

14 Q Now, that would not be true if we took out the ten  
15 dBs for the confidence level, would it?

16 A That's not necessarily the case because with --

17 Q Let me ask a question. I am sorry. Finish your  
18 answer.

19 A With a 86.3 B differential, and you should have at  
20 least another six dB of margin for the first adjacent  
21 channel, that is 92.3 dB. If I drop that down another ten  
22 dB, that is still a huge amount of discrimination that is  
23 necessary through filtering and antenna discrimination.

24 Q Let me go at this a different way. At 5.5  
25 microvolts --

1           A     It is two microvolts per meter. It is 5.5 dB  
2     above a microvolt.

3           Q     I am sorry. It is 5.5 dBu, right? Is that where  
4     we are?

5           A     Yes, sir, which is a little less than two  
6     microvolts per meter.

7           Q     How much signal would that put at the receiver  
8     terminal? How much voltage roughly?

9           A     I haven't calculated it, but it would be expected  
10    to be below the receive noise.

11          Q     Are you aware that this is a monaural  
12    transmission?

13          A     I am.

14          Q     And are you aware that a study was made of a  
15    receiver of the same type as is in use at Fort Lee?

16          A     I am not.

17          Q     Pardon?

18          A     I am not.

19          Q     It is in Mr. Hidle's statement. You have not read  
20    Mr. Hidle's statement?

21          A     No, I have not.

22          Q     He said that he determined that one microvolt  
23    across the terminal would permit the receiver to operate.

24          A     I had understood that Mr. Hidle was referring to  
25    equipment which was not in use at the time of the study we

1 are talking about here.

2 Q We are talking about the receiver now.

3 A I understand that.

4 Q Is it your understanding the receiver was not in  
5 use at the time?

6 A I was told that the equipment wasn't the same. I  
7 assumed that meant the receiver.

8 Excuse me just a moment, Mr. Naftalin. Let's  
9 clarify something now.

10 Q Yes.

11 A When you are talking about one microvolt at the  
12 receiver terminals, that's not the same as a two microvolt  
13 per meter signal strength.

14 Q I understand. I will get there slowly. Right now  
15 we are not even talking about what was true five years ago  
16 or three years ago. We are talking about your statement  
17 that it cannot be done. That is what we are after.

18 You say it could not be done. You did not say it  
19 could not be done with a particular set of equipment,  
20 correct?

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: When you say could not be done  
22 completely --

23 MR. A. NAFTALIN: Yes.

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- could not eliminate  
25 completely?

1 MR. A. NAFTALIN: I understand.

2 BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

3 Q You are saying it is an impossibility?

4 A I'm saying it can't be done reliably.

5 Q Would you have any reason to dispute the statement  
6 that one microvolt at the receiver would permit the receiver  
7 to operate?

8 A What was the signal to noise ratio with that one  
9 microvolt at the receiver terminals?

10 Q I cannot answer that.

11 A Well, I would have to know that in order to  
12 respond.

13 Q You have not seen Mr. Hidle's statement?

14 A No, sir.

15 Q So at this point you have no basis to dispute his  
16 statement? You just do not know about it?

17 A I don't know about Mr. Hidle's statement, but a  
18 one microvolt signal across the receiver terminal as the  
19 best receiver would not be expected to produce an output  
20 which would be suitable for rebroadcast.

21 Q All right. And if somebody actually demonstrated  
22 that it was, what would you say to that?

23 A Wow.

24 Q Very good. At five microvolts, would the signal  
25 be more than one? I am sorry. At five dBu, would the

1 signal be more than one microvolt at the terminal?

2 A Well, that depends upon a calculation that  
3 involves the antenna gain and the loss in the transmission  
4 line. I don't have all that information.

5 Q Very good, although there is information like that  
6 in Mr. Hurst's and Mr. Hidle's statements. Is that correct?

7 A Of course, I haven't read Mr. Hidle's statement,  
8 but I don't recall that much detail in Mr. Hurst's  
9 statement.

10 Q Are you also aware that they did some measurements  
11 on that receiver and determined that it has a discrimination  
12 such that the first adjacent signal is no more than 33 dB  
13 stronger at the terminal than the desired signal so that you  
14 cannot notice the adjacent channel signal?

15 A I recall something like that in Mr. Hurst's  
16 statement about this discrimination against adjacent site  
17 channel signal.

18 Q Do you have any basis for disputing that?

19 A No, I don't.

20 Q Now, it is true also, as you say in your  
21 statement, that there can be antenna discrimination. Is  
22 that correct?

23 A Yes, there can be.

24 Q Give me in your opinion the greatest amount of  
25 antenna discrimination that can be expected.

1           A     I wouldn't expect that the antenna discrimination  
2     would be certainly in excess of 20 dB. That's extreme.

3                     One thing we have to take into account is not only  
4     the signal which comes directly from the station, from the  
5     undesired station, but we also have to consider the  
6     reflected signals from that undesired signal which would  
7     come from any buildings or objects any place in the vicinity  
8     which would reduce the total amount of discrimination that  
9     might be measured on an antenna range, for instance.

10          Q     You do not know about that; you are just saying  
11     that could be the case?

12          A     I say that could be the case from my experience in  
13     this field.

14          Q     I understand, but you have not examined this  
15     location? You do not know about this location?

16          A     No, I don't.

17          Q     But you are saying you do not think it could be  
18     more than about 20 dB?

19          A     That's right.

20          Q     If you accept the 33 dB discrimination in the  
21     receiver which has been measured and the 20 dB that you have  
22     put in, that is 53 dB, right? That leaves us a 36.3 dB  
23     differential.

24                     Now, you say that there could be sophisticated  
25     filtering. Is that right?

1           A     It would have to be very sophisticated.

2           Q     Is it your opinion that it is not possible to have  
3     filtering to the extent of 36 dB?

4           A     That's a high degree of filtering which doesn't  
5     affect the main channel.

6           Q     I am sorry? I did not hear that.

7           A     That is a very high degree of filtering, which  
8     would not have any impact upon the desired channel.

9           Q     Are you saying it is impossible?

10          A     I'm saying it's highly unlikely.

11                JUDGE STEINBERG: Can I back you up a little bit?  
12     You said 36 dB of filtering. Would you say if it had that  
13     amount of filtering it would affect the signal coming out of  
14     the translator.

15                THE WITNESS: No. The signal is coming in --

16                JUDGE STEINBERG: Coming in?

17                THE WITNESS: -- to the translator.

18                BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

19          Q     Have you heard of something called a co-channel  
20     eliminator?

21          A     Co-channel eliminator?

22          Q     Yes.

23          A     No.

24          Q     If I showed you a piece of paper, maybe that would  
25     help. I represent to you that this equipment was in use in

1 1994 and 1995.

2 MR. ARONOWITZ: Excuse me. When was this  
3 equipment in use?

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: He said it was not in use in  
5 1994 and 1995.

6 MR. ARONOWITZ: Okay.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Is that what the statement was?

8 MR. A. NAFTALIN: No. This was in use.

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Was in use. I misheard  
10 you. Am I the only one who misheard it? I guess I am.

11 MR. A. NAFTALIN: My representation is that this  
12 was in use.

13 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. You will establish that  
14 when Mr. Turro gets on the stand or another engineer --

15 MR. A. NAFTALIN: That is correct.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- that actually saw it there  
17 during that period of time?

18 MR. A. NAFTALIN: This is not a hypothetical  
19 question.

20 MR. ARONOWITZ: So right now we are just assuming  
21 it is in use?

22 MR. A. NAFTALIN: For purposes of the question.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: For purposes of the question,  
24 right.

25 THE WITNESS: I am familiar with that. This type



1 of approach has been used in cable systems particularly to  
2 cancel out undesired co-channel signals.

3 BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

4 Q And also adjacent signals?

5 A It can be so used, yes.

6 Q Would you look at this little picture at the  
7 bottom here? Does that constitute a representation of 50 dB  
8 of signal cancellation for adjacent channel?

9 A It's a very narrow notch.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: Excuse me. Let Mr. Cohen  
11 finish, and then I will recognize you.

12 THE WITNESS: My problem with this is the  
13 horizontal -- what this represents is that for a narrow  
14 carrier there is a 50 dB differential between the main  
15 channel and the adjacent channel.

16 What it doesn't establish for me, though, is what  
17 the discrimination is for the full 200 kilohertz of band  
18 width for the channel, which would be extremely important in  
19 avoiding any kind of interference from the adjacent channel  
20 station to the desired station.

21 BY MR. A. NAFTALIN:

22 Q Now, does it make any difference that this is a  
23 monaural signal; that the desired signal is monaural? It  
24 makes it easier, does it not?

25 A Well, yes, it does make it somewhat easier because